Distr.
GENERAL

UNCTAD/ITP/55
15 February 1991

ENGLISH ONLY

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

# INCIDENCE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES ON IMPORTS OF GSP-COVERED PRODUCTS

Study prepared by Don P. Clark */

---

*/ Associate Professor of Economics at the University of Tennessee, United States of America.

GE.91-55198/2941B

READEX FICHE

CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Paragraphs |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction ..... | 1 - 4 |
| II. | Methodological considerations ..... | 5 - 12 |
| | A. Non-tariff measures ..... | 5 - 9 |
| | B. Measurement of trade coverage ..... | 10 - 12 |
| III. | Incidence of non-tariff measures ..... | 13 - 32 |
| IV. | Conclusions ..... | 33 - 35 |
| | Statistical annex | |

## Chapter I

## INTRODUCTION

1. The recently concluded second comprehensive review of the generalized system of preferences (TD/B/C.5/130) recounted the actual experience with the GSP over the past decade. Problems and shortcomings related to effective utilization of the GSP were discussed, and proposals were advanced for improving the system in the 1990s. Concern was expressed over the proliferation of non-tariff measures (NTMs) in several preference-giving countries which limit access to preferential treatment thereby reducing the effectiveness of GSP schemes as trade promotion instruments.

2. Under the GSP, preference-giving countries extend tariff preferences to certain products exported from designated beneficiary countries while retaining most-favoured-nation duties on imports from non-preferred supply sources, i.e. developed countries. Tariff preferences are intended to stimulate exports from beneficiaries and encourage investment in export-related activities. When exports of GSP-covered products confront NTMs in markets of preference-giving countries, beneficiaries find it difficult to expand exports in response to tariff preferences, since NTMs counter the price incentives inherent in the preferential tariff margins.

3. The present study identifies NTMs outside the GSP which are applied by preference-giving countries to products covered under GSP schemes. Trade coverage ratios are calculated to assess both the extent of application and severity of NTM use on GSP-covered products. Major beneficiaries affected by NTMs are also identified.

4. The study finds that almost one quarter ($7.7 billion) of GSP-covered products ($33.3 billion) in 1986 trade terms were affected by NTMs in 10 OECD preference-giving countries. Results of the study also show that GSP-covered products face a wide variety of NTMs in markets of preference-giving countries. Heavy reliance is placed by certain preference-giving countries on the use of "hard-core" NTMs. In the light of these findings, NTMs can be expected to constitute an important deterrent to imports of GSP-covered products. Preference-giving countries are therefore encouraged to take appropriate action to deal with the NTMs which limit access to GSP preferential treatment. In this regard an important means by which improved utilization of the GSP could be achieved would be to exempt GSP-covered products from NTMs used in markets of preference-giving countries.

## Chapter II

## METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

### A. Non-tariff measures

5. Non-tariff measures encompass any measures (public or private) other than tariffs that operate directly or indirectly to affect international trade flows. NTMs raise prices of both imports and import-competing goods, and tend to favour domestic over foreign supply sources by causing importers and foreign exporters to charge higher prices and/or restrict import volumes.

6. Non-tariff measures include a wide variety of specific measures which differ greatly in their degree of restrictiveness. UNCTAD's Data Base on Trade Control Measures codes more than 100 different NTMs. A necessary step in assessing the extent of NTM application on imports is to establish meaningful NTM categories. The UNCTAD secretariat has adopted three basic working definitions: "broad" definition NTMs; "narrow" definition NTMs; and quantitative restrictions.

7. The broad definition 1/ of NTMs includes certain para-tariff measures, import deposits and surcharges, variable levies, anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions (including investigations, duties, and undertakings), quantitative restrictions (including prohibitions, quotas, non-automatic licences, State monopolies, voluntary export restraints, restraints under the Multi-Fibre Arrangement (MFA) and similar textile arrangements), import surveillance, automatic licences, and certain price control measures. All NTMs applied at the border for which information is available from UNCTAD's Data Base on Trade Control Measures are included in the broad definition.

8. The narrow definition excludes from the broad group para-tariff measures, import deposits and surcharges, anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions, automatic licensing, and import surveillance measures. The excluded NTMs are those which have a potential to restrain imports, but are viewed as being less restrictive in impact than the NTMs retained in the narrow definition group. For example, automatic licences may be freely granted. They may be used primarily to monitor imports and to signal concern over import surges. Anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions are considered by many to have an uncertain impact on imports even though the threat of duty imposition can alter trade patterns in a manner similar to other NTMs. 2/

9. Quantitative restrictions reduce the quantity of imports of a particular good from all sources, or from a single supply source. Non-automatic licences, quotas, prohibitions, voluntary export restraints, single channel (State monopoly) for imports, and restraints under the MFA are included in this NTM category. These NTMs can have a pronounced restrictive impact on imports. Quantitative restrictions, along with the variable levy, are commonly referred to as "hard-core" NTMs. Considerable importance is attached to these hard-core measures when assessing the severity of NTMs.

## B. Measurement of trade coverage

10. The ideal measure of restrictiveness associated with a specific NTM would compare actual imports entering under the NTM with what imports would have been under free trade. Since such a comparison is not possible, it is common practice to assess the incidence of NTMs on imports by using the trade coverage ratio. The trade coverage ratio measures the share of total imports (by value) subject to a given NTM. This protection measure indicates the extent of NTM application rather than the effects of NTMs on prices, production, consumption, and import volumes.

11. GSP beneficiaries and GSP-covered products eligible for preferential tariff treatment in the 1986 base year were identified by using GATT trade and tariff computer tapes. 3/ Since NTMs are often imposed on imports of a specific product from a specific country, it is necessary to start the analysis at the tariff-line level of product aggregation. Trade flows in GSP-covered products at the tariff-line level are matched with information on product-specific NTMs applied in 1989, contained in the UNCTAD Data Base on Trade Control Measures. 4/ Trade coverage ratios are calculated for NTM groups, and results are aggregated to correspond to traditional product coverage groups as defined by the Standard International Trade Classification (SITC).

12. Shortcomings inherent in this method of assessing the incidence of NTMs should be kept in mind when interpreting the trade coverage ratios. 5/ Certain sets of calculations will understate the extent of NTM application since many NTMs, including government procurement policies, domestic subsidies, export subsidies, and restrictive business practices, are not coded in the data set. The trade coverage ratios are calculated using NTM-distorted import values. Protection will tend to be understated for product groups facing the most restrictive NTMs, since calculations are performed using the lower NTM-distorted import values. An additional problem with the trade coverage ratio is that the incidence of NTM application will tend to be exaggerated in cases where the NTM actually applies to only part of a tariff-line but calculations are performed at the tariff-line level.

## Chapter III

## INCIDENCE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES

13. Table 1 of the statistical annex presents a detailed inventory of NTMs found to apply against GSP-covered imports under schemes of major preference-giving countries. 6/ Figures in the table refer to the value of GSP-covered imports affected by NTMs. Individual NTMs are arranged into groups that correspond to those used in subsequent tables. Tables 3 through 11 show trade coverage ratios for groups of NTMs applied against imports of GSP-covered products. 7/ The incidence of 1989 NTMs is evaluated using 1986 import values in all sets of calculations. Major beneficiaries affected by NTMs are identified in table 12. Figures in this table represent the value and percentage of GSP-covered imports facing NTMs from "most affected" beneficiaries. The beneficiaries most affected by NTMs also tend to be the major beneficiaries under each GSP scheme, except in the case of Austria.

### Austria

14. The incidence of NTMs on GSP-covered imports into Austria was found to be extremely low (annex, table 3). NTMs (broad definition) affected $8.7 million worth, or slightly more than 2 per cent of the total value of GSP-covered imports. About 400 trade flows were affected by these NTMs. NTMs were applied in the agricultural sector only, and were product-specific, consisting primarily of quotas on unroasted coffee 8/ and, to a much smaller extent, price actions (variable levies) against imports of certain vegetables. Unlike other GSP schemes, the beneficiaries most affected by NTMs (table 12) were not found to be the major beneficiaries under Austria's scheme.

### Canada

15. A large share of Canadian imports of GSP-covered products in 1986 was subject to NTMs. 9/ NTMs (broad definition) affected $935.0 million worth, or 63.9 per cent of GSP-covered products (table 4). Nearly 400 trade flows were affected by NTMs. The most common individual NTM applied across all GSP-covered items was automatic licences. Canada placed heavy reliance on hard-core NTMs. Included here were restraints under the MFA, non-automatic licences, anti-dumping actions, and voluntary export restraints.

16. Non-tariff measure use in Canada was heavily concentrated in iron and steel products, and in certain manufacturing sectors. Automatic licences were used to monitor iron and steel imports. Heavy reliance was placed on hard-core NTMs in manufacturing sectors of considerable export interest to the developing countries. Non-automatic licences were applied to imports of clothing. A bilateral restraint agreement covered Canada's imports of textiles, originating mostly from Hong Kong, Taiwan Province of China, the Republic of Korea, and China. Voluntary export restraints were used to regulate imports of certain footwear from the Republic of Korea, Hong Kong, and China.

17. Canada placed heavy reliance on anti-dumping actions to influence imports of GSP-covered products. Trade coverage of this NTM across all products, expressed in percentage terms, was highest in the case of Canada. Such actions were primarily associated with iron and steel imports from the Republic of Korea, Brazil and Mexico, and shoe imports originating from the Republic of Korea, China, and Hong Kong.

EEC

18. Imports of GSP-covered products into the 10 EEC countries were affected substantially by NTMs (broad definition), which applied to more than one half of the total value of such imports in 1976. Trade coverage for these NTMs amounted to $4,217 million and affected more than 9,000 trade flows of GSP-covered products (table 5). A wide range of individual NTMs were applied to both agricultural and manufactured goods, including automatic licences, anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions and "hard-core" NTMs such as variable levies, quotas, restrictions under the MFA, and voluntary export restraints. Heavy reliance was placed on the use of hard-core NTMs.

19. Measures taken under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) which affected GSP-covered products included price actions (price surveillance, reference prices, variable levy), non-automatic licences, automatic licences, and quotas. NTMs were important deterrents to imports of iron and steel products. Included here were certain categories of automatic licences, price actions (price surveillance), voluntary export restraints, and anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions. Voluntary export restraints affected imports primarily from the Republic of Korea, Brazil, Venezuela, and Romania. Restraints under the MFA covered the EEC's imports of certain textile products. 10/ Valued at $3.7 billion, the MFA restraint agreement had the greatest trade coverage of any hard-core measure used by the EEC.

Finland

20. Finland applied NTMs (broad definition) to slightly more than 11 per cent of the total value of GSP-covered products, amounting to $47.3 million (table 6). About 150 trade flows were found to be affected by NTMs. Finland employed the following NTMs by order of importance: non-automatic and automatic licensing, an MFA consultation agreement, quotas and price actions (variable levy).

21. More than 70 per cent of the value of GSP-covered imports was accounted for by agricultural products. NTMs used in agriculture included non-automatic licences, global quotas on certain fruit and fruit juices, and variable levies on certain meat and vegetables. Automatic licences were used on imports of iron and steel products, and on selected manufactured product categories. Finland's MFA consultation agreement with Hong Kong, Macao, Pakistan, India, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Romania, and Malaysia constituted the most important hard-core NTM faced by GSP-covered imports of manufactured products.

Japan

22. In Japan, the trade coverage of NTMs across all GSP-covered products was $439.4 million (table 7). About 6 per cent of the total value of such products were affected by 5 NTMs (broad definition) applied against about 600 trade flows of GSP-covered products. Hard-core NTMs, such as prohibitions, quotas, non-automatic licences, and State monopolies of imports were the most important NTMs used in both agriculture and manufacturing.

23. Considerable reliance was placed on the use of global quotas and prohibitions in both agricultural raw materials and leather products. These NTMs had the greatest trade coverage by value. Non-automatic licensing of imports affected more than one third of the value of GSP-covered textile imports, and was also used to regulate trade in chemicals and selected agricultural products. State monopolies on imports maintained by Japan, primarily on certain alcohol used in beverage products, had the lowest impact on GSP-covered products.

Norway

24. Non-tariff measures (broad definition) applied by Norway affected $134.6 million worth, or more than 30 per cent of all GSP-covered imports (table 8). NTMs affected more than 300 trade flows. Norway had the third highest overall incidence of NTMs as measured by the trade coverage ratio. A variety of NTMs were applied. By order of their importance in 1986 trade terms, they included automatic licences, discretionary licences, price actions (minimum prices), non-automatic licences, global quotas, import authorizations, and State monopoly of imports. The incidence of NTMs, as measured by the trade coverage ratio, was the greatest in the agricultural sector.

25. Most NTMs were sector-specific in application. Heavy reliance was placed on minimum prices, global quotas in the case of flowers and other plants, and on non-automatic licences in agriculture. A State monopoly of imports governed trade in certain chemical products. Imports of manufactured products, other than those identified separately in the tables, were affected by automatic licences. Non-automatic licences were necessary for imports of certain manufactured goods, primarily textiles, clothing, and footwear, as well as for selected agricultural products.

Sweden

26. Sweden applied NTMs (broad definition) to $50.6 million worth, or about 9 per cent of the value of all GSP-covered products (table 9). NTMs were found to affect more than 400 trade flows. The seven categories of individual NTMs used included automatic licences, State monopoly of imports, price actions (variable levies), import authorizations, non-automatic licences, and quotas. The incidence of NTMs was greatest in agriculture where considerable use is made of variable levies and State monopoly of imports. Non-automatic licences and quotas affected a small part of the value of agricultural imports. Certain steel imports were subject to automatic licences, and certain chemical imports were controlled by a State monopoly of imports. Automatic licences were required for imports of some textile products.

Switzerland

27. Non-tariff measures (broad definition) were applied to approximately 8 per cent of the total value of Switzerland's GSP-covered imports. The trade coverage of NTMs amounted to $88 million (table 10). More than 300 trade flows were affected by these NTMs. Quotas, automatic licences, non-automatic licences, and State monopoly of imports were the primary NTMs used. Hard-core NTMs with the greatest trade coverage by value included non-automatic licences and global quotas. Considerable use was made of NTMs to support the regulated agricultural market, while only a small number of industrial imports were subject to NTMs.

28. Agricultural imports faced the hard-core NTMs - non-automatic licences, quotas, and prohibitions. Seasonal tariffs and seasonal quotas were applied to most fruit and vegetables to support the "Three Phase System", whereby imports were permitted to replace seasonal shortfalls in domestic production but were restricted when Swiss fruit and vegetables were in season. Industrial sectors were relatively free of NTMs.

United States of America

29. In the United States, trade coverage of NTMs (broad definition) was more than $1.6 billion, or about 12 per cent of the total value of GSP-covered imports (table 11). More than 300 trade flows of GSP-covered products were affected by NTMs. Anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions, quotas, and price actions (flexible import fees) were the primary NTMs used. Unlike most other nations, the United States did not make use of import licensing schemes. MFA NTMs on textiles and clothing products did not play a role, as these products are legally excluded from the United States GSP scheme.

30. Agriculture had the highest incidence of NTMs. Flexible import fees and quotas were specific to the agricultural sector, and were governed by Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Such measures were used to maintain the price support programmes operated by the United States Department of Agriculture. In the case of GSP-covered products, these NTMs were primarily used to regulate imports of certain products containing sugar. Most other GSP-covered agricultural products did not face quantitative import restrictions.

31. Imports of most GSP-covered industrial products were not affected substantially by NTMs (narrow definition). Little emphasis was placed upon the use of hard-core NTMs in manufacturing since, as mentioned above, most import-sensitive products from the iron and steel, textile and clothing, certain chemical, and leather product groups were statutorily excluded from GSP-eligibility under the United States scheme.

32. Anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions constituted the most important NTM group in terms of the value of trade coverage. The United States was found to be second only to Canada in the application of such measures, as reflected in the trade coverage ratio. Cut flowers, iron and steel products, and non-ferrous metal products were the major targets of such actions, which were invoked to a lesser degree in chemicals and in selected manufactured products.

## Chapter IV

## CONCLUSIONS

33. One might expect imports of GSP-covered products to be relatively free from NTMs, since many import-sensitive items were statutorily excluded from GSP-eligibility under most schemes. However, this was not found to be the case, as imports of GSP-covered products confront a wide variety of NTMs in the markets of preference-giving countries. Considerable reliance was placed by some of these countries on the use of hard-core NTMs to limit imports eligible for preferential tariff treatment. Examples include variable levies in the EEC, quotas and non-automatic licences in Japan, voluntary export restraints in Canada, non-automatic licences in Canada, and restrictions under the MFA in the EEC, Canada, and Finland.

34. Major beneficiaries under the various GSP schemes appeared to be those most affected by NTMs. Percentages of GSP-covered imports facing NTMs for each of these beneficiaries were found to be extremely high in all cases. Since major beneficiaries also tend to be affected most by quantitative limitations inherent in GSP schemes, these limitations and NTMs outside the GSP can be expected to exhibit similar country incidence patterns.

35. Based on results of this investigation, particularly those related to the hard-core NTMs, it is clear that NTMs affect and could be an important deterrent to imports of GSP-covered products. This NTM use counters the original intent of the GSP, namely to extend preferential treatment to exports from developing countries. Preference-giving countries should therefore take actions to deal with the NTMs which limit GSP benefits by eroding incentives inherent in preferential tariff margins. An important means by which improved utilization of the GSP could be achieved would be to exempt GSP-covered products from NTMs used in markets of preference-giving countries. These countries should also refrain from imposing new NTMs which would serve to limit their imports of GSP-covered products.

## Notes

1/ See annex table 1 for list of NTMs.

2/ Mark Herander and J. Brad Schwartz, "An empirical test of the impact of the threat of U.S. trade policy: The case of anti-dumping duties", Southern Economic Journal (July 1984), found foreign firms do incorporate the threat of anti-dumping duties into their pricing decisions and may act to restrict shipments. See also TD/B/1240, pp. 10-11.

3/ Excluded from the analysis are products designated as GSP-eligible which enter preference-giving countries duty-free on an MFN basis and GSP-eligible products for which no trade is recorded.

4/ The UNCTAD Data Base on Trade Control Measures is described in UNCTAD/DDM/Misc.18. Only NTMs outside the GSP are included in the present analysis.

5/ Additional shortcomings are discussed in Alan V. Deardorff and Robert M. Stern, "Methods of measurement of non-tariff barriers" (UNCTAD/ST/MD/28).

6/ Data were not available to assess GSP schemes offered by Australia or New Zealand.

7/ When a single tariff-line product is affected by more than one NTM subcategory, the individual trade flow is counted only once in the corresponding total. For example, the trade coverage ratio for total quantitative restrictions (QRs) would show the percentage, by value, of GSP-covered imports subject to one or more QR.

8/ In certain countries, measures are applied in the framework of international commodity agreements. As some of these measures discriminate against imports originating in non-member countries, these measures have been included in the Data Base, but normally only with regard to imports from non-member countries. The measures are maintained in the Data Base, even though they may not be operational at all times, for instance when the free market price is above the "stabilized" price level, provided that price fluctuations can automatically activate the relevant measure.

9/ The high level of aggregation of the Canadian Customs Tariff may cause calculated ratios to overstate the importance of NTMs in cases where NTMs apply to only part of a tariff line.

10/ The incidence of restraints under the MFA is reflected in the trade coverage ratios and frequency indices shown for total QRs used in textile and clothing product groups. The MFA is not shown separately in the tables, since this NTM is sector-specific.

ANNEX

Table 1

INVENTORY OF OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES, 1989
(Millions of 1986 US dollars)[a/]

| | Preference-giving country | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Austria | Canada | EEC | Finland | Japan | Norway | Sweden | Switzerland | USA |
| **Automatic licences (al)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Automatic licence | - | - | - | 9.2 | - | 91.8 | 24.8 | 33.0 | - |
| Liberal licence | - | - | - | - | - | x | - | 6.5 | - |
| Import surveillance | - | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Surveillance licence | - | 385.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Import monitoring | - | 126.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Retrospective surveillance | - | - | 45.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Community surveillance | - | - | 943.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MFA surveillance | - | 202.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MFA administrative agreement | - | - | 62.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Anti-dumping/countervailing duty actions (ad/cv)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Anti-dumping duties | - | 99 7 | 55.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 229.7 |
| Countervailing duties | - | - | 7.6 | - | - | - | - | - | 175.4 |
| Anti-dumping investigation | - | - | 61.8 | - | - | - | - | - | 355.3 |
| Countervailing investigation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 184.4 |
| Undertaking | - | 9 4 | 18.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 140.3 |
| **Price actions (Price)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Variable levy | x | - | 0.2 | x | - | - | 8 7 | - | - |
| Minimum prices | - | - | - | - | - | 15.9 | - | - | - |
| Reference prices | - | - | 77.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Price surveillance | - | - | 338.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Flexible import fees | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 558.8 |
| **Non-automatic licence (nal)** | | | | | | | | | |
| nal/licence | - | 70.7 | 1.1 | - | - | - | 0.5 | x | - |
| nal/discretionary licence | - | - | - | 10.5 | - | 26.2 | - | 25.7 | - |
| nal/import permit | - | 532.0 | - | - | 176.5 | - | - | - | - |
| nal/import restricted | - | 24.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| nal/dependent on purchase | - | - | - | - | - | 8.0 | - | - | - |
| Import authorization | - | - | - | - | 182.5 | 3.9 | 0.6 | - | - |
| **Quotas/prohibitions (q/p)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Quotas | 7.6 | - | - | - | - | x | x | - | 615.2 |
| Global quota (unallocated) | - | - | - | 0.8 | 201.0 | 6.7 | - | 34.1 | - |
| Global quota (allocated) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bilateral quota | - | x | - | - | - | x | x | - | - |
| Seasonal quota | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7.1 | - |
| Total prohibition | - | 2.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Temporary prohibition | - | - | - | - | - | x | - | - | - |

Table 1 (continued)

| | Preference-giving country | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Austria | Canada | EEC | Finland | Japan | Norway | Sweden | Switzerland | USA |
| Voluntary export restraints (VERs) | | | | | | | | | |
| Voluntary export restraints | - | 64.4 | 15.7 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 2 |
| Single channel for imports (sc) | | | | | | | | | |
| State monopoly of imports | - | - | - | - | 63.7 | 1.7 | 12.8 | 1.1 | - |
| Sole importing agency | - | - | - | - | - | x | - | - | - |
| Multifibre arrangement, similar textile arrangements (MFA) | | | | | | | | | |
| MFA restraint agreement | - | - | 3 657.8 | - | - | 2.4 | - | - | - |
| MFA quota | - | 549.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MFA consultation agreement | - | - | 29.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MFA consultation | - | - | - | 5.6 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Textiles quota | - | 99.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Source: UNCTAD secretariat calculations.

a/ Import values less than one hundred thousand US dollars are denoted by x.

Table 2

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES IN
10 OECD PREFERENCE-GIVING COUNTRIES

| Preference-giving country | GSP-covered imports | NTM-affected imports |
|---|---|---|
| | (Millions of 1986 US dollars) | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Austria | 364.2 | 8.7 |
| Canada | 1 462.9 | 934.8 |
| EEC | 7 866.2 | 4 216.3 |
| Finland | 422.2 | 47.3 |
| Japan | 7 087.0 | 439.4 |
| Norway | 430.2 | 134.6 |
| Sweden | 581.6 | 50.6 |
| Switzerland | 1 143.4 | 88.0 |
| United States of America | 13 981.0 | 1 635.8 |
| 10 OECD preference-giving countries | 33 338.7 | 7 655.5 |
| NTM product coverage impact (percentage) (3)/(2) | | 23.0 |

Source: UNCTAD/ITP/55, annex, tables 2-10.

Table 3

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: AUSTRIA, 1989a/
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | QR Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 360.4 | 2.4 | – | – | 2.4 | – | 2.1 | – | 2.1 | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 360.2 | 2.4 | – | – | 2.4 | – | 2.1 | – | 2.1 | – | |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 0.3 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 0.4 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | |
| 67 | Iron and steel | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 1.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 1.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 364.4 | 2.4 | – | – | 2.4 | – | 2.1 | – | 2.1 | – | – |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 4

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: CANADA, 1989[a/]
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 94.9 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 65.0 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 9.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 0.4 | 38.5 | – | – | 38.5 | – | 38.5 | 38.5 | – | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 242.6 | 78.2 | 52.2 | 11.3 | 26.0 | – | 26.0 | 26.0 | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 146.2 | 86.6 | 86.6 | 18.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 33.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | 5.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 76.4 | 34.4 | – | – | 34.4 | – | 34.4 | 34.4 | – | – | – |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 1 043.3 | 68.9 | 55.4 | 7.8 | 61.8 | – | 61.8 | 51.4 | 0.3 | 6.2 | – |
| 61 | Leather | 16.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 76.9 | 52.1 | – | – | 52.1 | – | 52.1 | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 528.9 | 99.6 | 87.6 | 11.0 | 99.6 | – | 99.6 | 99.6 | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 117.5 | 100.0 | 98.1 | 1.9 | 55.0 | – | 55.0 | – | – | 55.0 | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 1 462.9 | 63.9 | 48.2 | 7.5 | 50.2 | – | 50.2 | 42.8 | 0.2 | 4.4 | – |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 5

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: EEC, 1989a/
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | QR Total | QR nal | QR q/p | QR VERs | QR sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 582.7 | 27.8 | 4.4 | – | 9.5 | 9.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | – | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 565.3 | 28.7 | 4.6 | – | 9.8 | 9.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | – | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 4.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 16.7 | 0.2 | – | – | 0.2 | – | 0.2 | – | – | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 82.3 | 81.5 | 59.1 | 4.0 | 32.4 | 24.9 | 20.5 | – | – | 18.6 | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 26.1 | 96.3 | 96.3 | 24.6 | 96.1 | 78.4 | 58.5 | – | – | 58.5 | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 12.8 | 1.1 | 1.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 672.8 | 3.8 | – | 3.1 | 0.7 | – | 0.7 | – | – | – | – |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 6 511.7 | 60.9 | 17.8 | 1.1 | 55.9 | 4.0 | 55.9 | – | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 149.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 445.6 | 75.2 | 12.2 | – | 75.1 | 1.9 | 74.9 | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 5 635.4 | 89.4 | 25.2 | – | 88.8 | 5.6 | 88.8 | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 7 866.2 | 53.6 | 15.7 | 1.7 | 47.4 | 4.3 | 46.5 | – | – | 0.2 | – |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 6

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: FINLAND, 1989[a/]
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 306.8 | 10.1 | – | – | 3.7 | – | 3.7 | 3.5 | 0.3 | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 303.8 | 9.3 | – | – | 2.8 | – | 2.8 | 2.5 | 0.3 | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | 0.1 | 100.0 | – | – | 100.0 | – | 100.0 | 100.0 | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 2.8 | 100.0 | – | – | 100.0 | – | 100.0 | 100.0 | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 1.7 | 76.6 | – | – | 47.7 | – | 47.7 | 47.7 | – | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 15.4 | 39.1 | 39.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 6.0 | 52.5 | 52.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 3.9 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 3.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 95.2 | 9.1 | 3.3 | – | 5.9 | – | 5.9 | – | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 5.0 | 47.7 | 47.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 20.9 | 26.2 | – | – | 26.2 | – | 26.2 | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 6.2 | 12.8 | 12.3 | – | 2.1 | – | 2.1 | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | – | – | – | – | – | – | 0 | – | – | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 422.2 | 11.2 | 2.2 | – | 4.2 | – | 4.2 | 2.5 | 0.2 | – | – |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 7

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: JAPAN, 1989[a/]
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 208.0 | 9.0 | - | - | 8.5 | - | 8.5 | 5.8 | - | - | 2.8 |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 134.1 | 9.7 | - | - | 8.9 | - | 8.9 | 8.9 | - | - | - |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 119.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 243.3 | 4.0 | - | - | 4.0 | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.1 | - | - |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 2 307.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 1 140.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 1 196.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | FUELS | 0.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 1 432.2 | 17.5 | - | - | 17.5 | - | 17.5 | 12.3 | 11.0 | - | 4.1 |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 2 895.3 | 5.6 | - | - | 5.6 | - | 5.6 | 5.6 | 1.2 | - | - |
| 61 | Leather | 8.0 | 69.8 | - | - | 69.8 | - | 69.8 | - | 69.8 | - | - |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 455.8 | 35.3 | - | - | 35.3 | - | 35.3 | 35.3 | - | - | - |
| 84 | Clothing | 149.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 85 | Footwear | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 7 087.0 | 6.2 | - | - | 6.2 | - | 6.2 | 5.1 | 2.8 | - | 0.9 |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 8

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: NORWAY, 1989a/
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 65.7 | 46.7 | 0.1 | – | 42.6 | 24.5 | 42.6 | 42.5 | 0.5 | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 65.2 | 47.1 | 0.1 | – | 42.9 | 24.7 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 0.5 | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 0.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 8.3 | 76.7 | – | – | 76.7 | – | 76.7 | 70.2 | 76.6 | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 4.6 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 0.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 3.9 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 7.9 | 20.9 | – | – | 20.9 | – | 20.9 | – | – | – | 20.9 |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 343.7 | 27.9 | 26.7 | – | 1.2 | – | 1.2 | 1.1 | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 3.1 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 26.0 | 15.1 | – | – | 15.1 | – | 15.1 | 14.5 | 0.1 | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 40.8 | 8.4 | – | – | 8.4 | – | 8.4 | 8.1 | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 0.8 | 16.2 | – | – | 16.2 | – | 16.2 | 16.2 | – | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 430.2 | 31.3 | 21.4 | – | 9.3 | 3.7 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 1.6 | – | 0.4 |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 9

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: SWEDEN, 1989[a/]
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | QR Total | QR nal | QR q/p | QR VERs | QR sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 31.8 | 57.4 | – | – | 52.7 | 27.8 | 26.9 | 2.1 | 0.1 | – | 24.8 |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 17.4 | 23.4 | – | – | 14.9 | 14.7 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 0.2 | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 6.3 | 99.2 | – | – | 99.2 | 99.2 | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 2.3 | 86.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 23.7 | 23.7 | 29.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 10.7 | 10.7 | 64.4 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 11.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 42.3 | 12.4 | – | – | 12.4 | – | 12.4 | 0.3 | – | – | 12.2 |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 481.4 | 3.8 | 3.7 | – | 0.1 | – | 0.1 | 0.1 | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 11.8 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 32.9 | 50.6 | 50.6 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 25.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 1.7 | 6.0 | – | – | 6.0 | – | 6.0 | – | 6.0 | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 581.6 | 8.7 | 4.3 | – | 3.9 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 0.2 | – | – | 2.2 |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 10

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: SWITZERLAND, 1989a/
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 112.3 | 53.5 | 19.2 | – | 51.4 | – | 51.1 | 15.3 | 35.9 | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 110.6 | 53.6 | 18.7 | – | 52.2 | – | 51.9 | 15.5 | 36.4 | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 1.0 | 83.5 | 83.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 28.2 | 8.4 | 4.6 | – | 8.4 | – | 3.8 | 0.5 | 3.3 | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 54.3 | 3.1 | 0.6 | – | 2.5 | – | 2.5 | 2.5 | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 10.4 | 2.1 | – | – | 2.1 | – | 2.1 | 2.1 | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 25.1 | 4.6 | – | – | 4.6 | – | 4.6 | 4.6 | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 84.6 | 27.3 | 19.3 | – | 15.6 | – | 8.5 | 7.6 | – | – | 0.9 |
| 6-8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 863.9 | 0.1 | – | – | 0.1 | – | – | 0.1 | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 4.6 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 1.6 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 71.3 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 2.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 0-9 | ALL ITEMS | 1 143.4 | 7.7 | 3.5 | – | 6.6 | – | 5.9 | 2.3 | 3.6 | – | 0.1 |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 11

TRADE COVERAGE OF NON-TARIFF MEASURES: UNITED STATES, 1989[a/]
(Percentages)

| SITC | PRODUCT COVERAGE | Imports 1986 (Millions US$) | Broad Definition | | | Narrow Definition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | QR | | | | |
| | | | Total | al | ad/cv | Total | Price | Total | nal | q/p | VERs | sc |
| 0 + 1 + 22 + 4 | ALL FOOD ITEMS | 1 840.3 | 49.4 | – | – | 33.1 | 30.1 | 33.1 | – | 33.1 | – | – |
| 0 | Food and live animals | 1 507.0 | 58.0 | – | – | 38.8 | 35.3 | 38.8 | – | 38.8 | – | – |
| 22 | Oil seeds and nuts | 0.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 4 | Animal/vegetable oils | 32.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 2 less (22 + 27 + 28) | AGRICULTURAL RAW MATERIALS | 173.4 | 61.3 | – | 60.4 | 1.0 | – | 1.0 | – | 1.0 | – | – |
| 27 + 28 + 67 + 68 | ORES AND METALS | 687.1 | 12.0 | – | 11.8 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 67 | Iron and steel | 102.4 | 13.5 | – | 11.9 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 68 | Non-ferrous metals | 501.7 | 13.7 | – | 13.7 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 3 | FUELS | 1.2 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 5 | CHEMICALS | 759.8 | 2.8 | – | 2.8 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 6–8 less (67 + 68) | MANUFACTURES, not chemicals | 10 519.0 | 4.9 | – | 4.6 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 61 | Leather | 319.8 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 65 | Textile yarn and fabrics | 150.0 | 2.4 | – | 2.4 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 84 | Clothing | 103.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 85 | Footwear | 12.5 | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – | – |
| 0–9 | ALL ITEMS | 13 981.0 | 11.7 | – | 5.0 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.4 | – | 4.4 | – | – |

Source: UNCTAD Trade Control Measures Information System.

a/ Computations were performed at the tariff-line level using 1986 import values, and results were aggregated to relevant product group levels.

Table 12

MAJOR BENEFICIARIES AFFECTED BY NON-TARIFF MEASURES ON IMPORTS OF GSP-COVERED PRODUCTS, 1989
(Thousands of US dollars)

| Beneficiary | Value a/ | Percent b/ | Beneficiary | Value | Percent | Beneficiary | Value | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Austria** | | | **Canada** | | | **EEC** | | |
| Ecuador | 2 990 | 41.2 | Rep. of Korea | 290 023 | 84.4 | Hong Kong | 2 052 385 | 47.8 |
| Viet Nam | 1 508 | 88.8 | Hong Kong | 205 970 | 83.8 | Rep. of Korea | 1 559 045 | 41.7 |
| Cuba | 1 005 | 98.2 | Brazil | 134 747 | 77.5 | China | 1 018 547 | 42.5 |
| Lao P. Dem. Rep. | 733 | 100.0 | China | 110 514 | 88.0 | India | 740 905 | 56.9 |
| Sri Lanka | 493 | 30.3 | India | 34 120 | 72.7 | Romania | 469 012 | 46.0 |
| India | 477 | 9.5 | Chile | 30 733 | 85.6 | Brazil | 459 595 | 29.3 |
| Malaysia | 387 | 18.1 | Mexico | 30 349 | 30.8 | Thailand | 389 317 | 55.0 |
| China | 306 | 12.3 | Thailand | 29 640 | 90.1 | Macao | 346 760 | 75.7 |
| Belize | 289 | 93.5 | Singapore | 28 103 | 59.3 | Pakistan | 342 001 | 54.4 |
| Uruguay | 226 | 37.0 | Peru | 21 335 | 96.7 | Philippines | 139 712 | 39.7 |
| **Finland** | | | **Japan** | | | **Norway** | | |
| Rep. of Korea | 14 822 | 55.8 | Taiwan Prov. China | 485 632 | 33.9 | Rep. of Korea | 93 123 | 59.9 |
| Panama export zone | 6 524 | 100.0 | China | 46 5982 | 63.0 | Israel | 19 553 | 61.9 |
| Costa Rica | 5 525 | 16.7 | Rep. of Korea | 394 439 | 27.5 | Argentina | 10 529 | 83.9 |
| Ecuador | 5 031 | 64.2 | Hong Kong | 285 088 | 64.5 | Morocco | 10 423 | 92.9 |
| Philippines | 4 774 | 70.2 | Saudi Arabia | 237 532 | 99.9 | China | 8 888 | 24.1 |
| Thailand | 4 697 | 38.3 | Singapore | 163 602 | 66.8 | Chile | 3 969 | 99.2 |
| Romania | 3 665 | 32.8 | Malaysia | 148 917 | 72.9 | Cyprus | 3 875 | 98.7 |
| China | 3 464 | 26.9 | Brazil | 131 450 | 31.5 | Turkey | 3 814 | 37.2 |
| Yugoslavia | 2 785 | 16.1 | Mexico | 58 514 | 44.8 | Brazil | 2 395 | 26.6 |
| Brazil | 2 267 | 3.8 | Bahamas | 57 530 | 100.0 | Thailand | 2 195 | 32.4 |
| **Sweden** | | | **Switzerland** | | | **United States of America** | | |
| Hong Kong | 21 045 | 17.2 | Rep. of Korea | 32 383 | 34.0 | Mexico | 698 341 | 10.4 |
| Brazil | 11 401 | 22.6 | Brazil | 21 298 | 35.8 | Brazil | 462 452 | 24.0 |
| China | 9 797 | 23.6 | Turkey | 20 440 | 38.7 | Dominican Rep. | 132 012 | 40.4 |
| Thailand | 9 767 | 57.3 | Thailand | 19 156 | 20.6 | Colombia | 123 271 | 59.5 |
| Rep. of Korea | 7 264 | 7.6 | Yugoslavia | 17 369 | 28.5 | Philippines | 90 232 | 21.7 |
| Romania | 6 363 | 30.3 | India | 14 256 | 44.4 | Venezuela | 65 000 | 31.1 |
| Malaysia | 5 809 | 23.0 | China | 11 358 | 26.7 | Guatemala | 52 691 | 61.8 |
| India | 5 329 | 36.2 | Israel | 10 558 | 13.5 | Thailand | 25 206 | 6.1 |
| Yugoslavia | 5 246 | 8.3 | Argentina | 7 709 | 70.5 | Peru | 23 968 | 12.8 |
| Bulgaria | 3 353 | 58.8 | Hong Kong | 7 470 | 3.8 | Costa Rica | 20 100 | 20.4 |

Source: UNCTAD secretariat calculations.

a/ GSP-covered imports affected by NTMs, 1986 values.

b/ Percentage of GSP-covered imports affected by NTMs.